

REMARKS

Applicant is filing this supplemental amendment because two changes to the claims were inadvertently left out of the previously filed office action response. The changes are in claims 3 and 5. In both of these claims, the word “flange” has been deleted and replaced by “washer”.

The examiner has objected to the disclosure because reference numeral 22 is used to designate a washer and a flange. Applicant has corrected this issue.

The examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide the proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The examiner finds no mention of a flange for setting the depth of penetration (claim 5) and the language “pointed end” (claim 6) is not found. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this objection. The language of these claims appeared in the claims as originally filed. Section 608.01(l) of the MPEP states that an applicant may rely on original claims to establish a disclosure. According to this Section, a claim should not be attacked either by objection or rejection because the subject matter is lacking in the drawing or description. Further, the pointed end as described in claim 6 is very clearly seen in Figs 1 and 3-6. As such, Applicant requests that the examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claims 3, 5 and 6 have been objected to. The office action states that claim 6 has been objected to because the examiner states it is unclear which flange or element the flange of claim 6 references. Applicant believes that the examiner is in fact referring to claim 3, as claim 6 does not have a flange. In claim 3, the flange is the washer 22. The specification indicates that the washer 22 may be added to provide stability so that the connector will remain normal to the concrete layer during installation.

In claim 5, the flange for setting the depth of penetration into the concrete layer is washer 18 used to support a layer of insulation during the fabrication of a precast wall panel using the connectors 10.

In claim 6, the pointed end used to set the distance is the pointed end of the over-molded component as seen in Figs. 1 and 3-6.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the '733 patent to Long. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The Long

reference does not have over-molded components as claimed by Applicant. Applicant has amended the claims to further clarify the differences between the Long reference and Applicant's invention. Specifically, the over-molded components of Applicant are at least one of the ends of the fiber composite shaft. The sleeve 23 of Long is in the middle of the fiber composite shaft. Accordingly, the Long reference does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1 and the Long reference does not anticipate the claim. As claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, these claims are also not anticipated by Long.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long in view of Keith. As neither Long nor Keith have the claimed over-molded component, these references do not render claim 6 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw this rejection.

The application has been amended to correct minor informalities, to further distinguish the application over the prior art, and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention so as to place the application, as a whole, into a prima facie condition for allowance.


Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that its claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance at this time, patentably distinguishing over the cited prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and passage to allowance are respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney at (515) 288-2500 to discuss the claims in an effort to reach a mutual agreement with respect to claim limitations in the present application which will be effective to define the patentable subject matter if the present claims are not deemed to be adequate for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

11/29/06


Emily E. Harris

Registration No. 56,201
DAVIS, BROWN, KOEHN,
SHORS & ROBERTS, P.C.
666 Walnut St., Suite 2500
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone: (515) 288-2500

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT